



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,016	12/27/2000	Yehuda Feuerstein	MSI-722US	6189

22801 7590 04/23/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,016

Applicant(s)

FEUERSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. No claim for priority has been made in this application.
2. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 12/27/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1 – 8, 20 – 24, 33 – 36, 45 – 54, and 71 – 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber.
4. As per claim 1, Farber discloses a network system comprising:
 - a. a first device to maintain an original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 43 Line 59 – 61);

Art Unit: 2131

- b. a second device to maintain a replica resource remotely from the first device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 43 Line 59 – 61);
- c. memory to store a cached descriptor corresponding to the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 12 Line 38 – 43, Column 3 Line 56 – 57, Column 39 Line 24 – 25 and Figure 1(b): Applicant defines a Descriptor can be a hash function of the resource, a calculated checksum (CRC) or any other functional identifier that can be formulated to provide a basis for comparison of different instantiations of a resource. Farber teaches that a “True Name” of a data item (for example, files, database records and the like) obtained by computing a MD, or a hash function, is virtually guaranteed to represent the given data item and only that particular data item. Therefore, a True Name is qualified as a Descriptor and both of them are served as resource unique identifiers);
- d. a security component to determine whether the replica resource will pose a security risk to the second device upon receipt of a request for the replica resource, the security component (Farber: inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 49 and Column 43 Line 62 – 64):
- e. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30 and Column 37 Line 36 – 42); and
- f. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing

Art Unit: 2131

the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33).

5. As per claim 2, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

6. As per claim 3, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 Figure 28).

7. As per claim 4, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17).

8. As per claim 5, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security

Art Unit: 2131

risk, and the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32).

9. As per claim 6, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are; not equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security risk, the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

10. As per claim 7, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component formulates the cached descriptor when the original resource is replicated to create the replica resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

11. As per claim 8, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component is configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the second device (Farber: inter alia, Column 34 Line 48 – 50).

Art Unit: 2131

12. As per claim 20, Farber discloses a network server comprising:

- a. a server component to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 25 Line 26 – 28); and
- b. a security component that is registerable with the server component during run-time to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request (Farber: inter alia, Column 43 Line 62 – 63 and Column 34 Line 45 – 49).

13. As per claim 21, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches if the security component determines that the resource will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate: that the resource is not available (Farber: inter alia, Column 25 Line 26 – 28).

14. As per claim 22, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

- a. the security component: formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57); and
- b. determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

Art Unit: 2131

15. As per claim 23, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);
- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);
- c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

16. As per claim 24, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);
- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a

Art Unit: 2131

file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, initiates that the resource stored on the network server be replaced with a copy of the original resource maintained on the file server (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32); and

d. initiates that the cached descriptor be replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

17. As per claim 33, Farber discloses a computing device comprising an operating system to:

a. access resources to service requests (Farber, see inter alia, Column 43 Line 62 – 64);

b. a security component to determine whether a resource will pose a security risk to the computing device upon receipt of a request to access the resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 43 Line 62 – 64, Column 34 Line 45 – 50, and Column 31 Line 30);

c. the security component configured to: formulate a descriptor corresponding to the resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30);

Art Unit: 2131

d. retrieve a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource the cached descriptor stored on a remote second computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Column Line 15 – 23 and Column 23 Line 41 – 43);

e. compare the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 36 – 42); and

f. determine that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

18. As per claim 34, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 33). Farber further teaches the security component formulates the cached descriptor when the resource is initially requested (Farber, see inter alia, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 13 Line 56 – 57).

19. As per claim 35, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 33). Farber further teaches the security component initiates a remote data server to formulate the cached descriptor and store the cached descriptor on the remote second computing device when the resource is stored on the computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Column 23 Line 15 – 23 and Column 23 Line 41 – 43: to retrieve and store the cache descriptor can be considered as the dual services).

20. As per claim 36, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 33). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, the security component initiates that the resource be replaced with a

Art Unit: 2131

copy of the resource maintained on the remote second computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17).

21. As per claim 45, Farber discloses a method comprising:
 - a. receiving a request for a replica resource stored on a computing device ((Farber, see inter alia, Column 43 Line 58 – 62);
 - b. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to an original resource stored on a second computing device remotely located from the computing device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30 and Column 37 Line 36 – 42);
 - c. determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28);
 - d. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

Art Unit: 2131

22. As per claim 46, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches allowing the request if said determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Figure 28).

23. As per claim 47, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches redirecting the request to indicate that the replica resource is not available if determining that the replica resource poses a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Figure 28).

24. As per claim 48, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the cached descriptor with the second descriptor if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17).

25. As per claim 49, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the replica resource with a copy of the original resource if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32).

26. As per claim 50, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the cached descriptor with the second descriptor if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

Art Unit: 2131

27. As per claim 51, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the original resource is replicated to create the replica resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

28. As per claim 52, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the replica resource is initially requested (Farber, see inter alia, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57).

29. As per claim 53, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches determining whether the request will pose a security risk (Farber, see inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 50 and Column 31 Line 30).

30. As per claim 54, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches determining whether the request will pose a security risk; and redirecting the request to indicate that the replica resource is not available if determining that the request poses a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see inter alia, Figure 28).

31. As per claim 71, Farber discloses a method determining whether an operating system can access a resource without a security risk, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2131

- a. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30);
- b. retrieving a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource, the cached descriptor stored remotely (Farber, see inter alia, Column 23 Line 15 – 2 and Column 23 Line 41 – 43);
- c. comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 36 – 42); and
- d. determining that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

32. As per claim 72, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 71). Farber further teaches allowing the operating system to access the resource if said determining that the resource is not a security risk (Farber, see inter alia, Figure 28).

33. As per claim 73, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 71). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the resource is created (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 4 – 17 and Column 17 Line 31 – 43).

34. As per claim 74, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 71). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the resource is initially requested (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 4 – 17).

35. Claim 14 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers.

36. As per claim 14, Brothers discloses a network server comprising:

a. a server component to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource; and a security component that is registerable with the server component during run-time to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 10 – 13 and Figure 8).

37. As per claim 15, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach if the security component determines that the request will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate; that the resource is not available (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 17 – 21 and Figure 8).

38. As per claim 16, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B).

Art Unit: 2131

39. As per claim 17, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B).

40. As per claim 18, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

41. As per claim 19, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach:

- a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3);
- b. the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource

Art Unit: 2131

identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 and Figure 13B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

42. Claim 9 – 13, 55 – 60 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber (as applied to claim 1 and 8 above), in view of Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers.

43. As per claim 9, Farber teaches the claimed invention of resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment (see claim 8). Farber does not expressly teach the request designates a resource locator. Brothers

Art Unit: 2131

further disclose the request designates a resource locator (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 8 Parag. 0087 Line 1 – 3).

44. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brothers within the system of Farber because Brothers discloses the resource access in the distributed network environment through a secure universal resource locator (URL) in accordance with the emerging internet-based web applications.

45. As per claim 10, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

46. As per claim 11, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

Art Unit: 2131

47. As per claim 12, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

48. As per claim 13, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Brothers further teach:

a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D);

b. the security component is configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the second device; the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

49. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

50. As per claim 55, Farber teaches the claimed invention of resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment (see claim 45). Farber does not expressly teach uniform resource locator (URL) related subject matters. Brothers further disclose the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B).

51. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brothers within the system of Farber because Brothers discloses the resource access in the distributed network environment through a secure universal resource locator (URL) in accordance with the emerging internet-based web applications.

52. As per claim 56, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

53. As per claim 57, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

54. As per claim 58, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach:

55. a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D);
- b. the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

56. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

57. As per claim 59, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the

Art Unit: 2131

method of claim 45. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

58. As per claim 60, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 58). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 58. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

59. As per claim 75, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 71). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 71. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

60. Claim 25 – 32, 37 – 44 and 61 – 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers, in view of Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber.

61. As per claim 25, Brothers teach:

a. an Internet server to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 10 – 13 and Figure 8);

b. a security component that is registerable with the Internet server during run-time, the security component having: a validation component to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170).

62. Brothers do not teach:

c. an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request.

63. Farber teaches an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request (Farber, see inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 50).

64. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farber within the system of Brothers

Art Unit: 2131

because Farber discloses resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment as part of emerging internet-based applications.

65. As per claim 37, Brothers teach a validation component to determine whether a request for a resource poses a security risk (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170).

66. Brothers do not teach an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource poses a security risk.

67. Farber teaches an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource poses a security risk (Farber, see inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 50).

68. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farber within the system of Brothers because Farber discloses resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment as part of emerging internet-based applications.

69. As per claims 26 and 38, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters ((Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag.

0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

70. As per claims 27 and 39, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

71. As per claims 28 and 40, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

72. As per claims 29 and 41, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach:

a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the resource and the

Art Unit: 2131

resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022

Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D); and

b. the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 and Figure 13B).

73. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

74. As per claims 30 and 42, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

75. a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57); and

76. b. determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

77. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

78. As per claims 31 and 43, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);
- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);
- c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

79. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

80. As per claims 32 and 44, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);

- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);
 - c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, initiates that the resource stored on the network server be replaced with a copy of the original resource maintained on the file server (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32); and
 - d. initiates that the cached descriptor be replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).
81. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

82. As per claim 61, Brothers teach:

- a. receiving a request for a resource (Brothers, see inter alia, Figure 2D);
- b. implementing security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Brothers, see inter alia, Figure 8);

c. determining whether the request will pose a security risk (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0171);

83. Brothers do not teach determining whether the resource will pose a security risk if allowing the request.

84. Farber teaches determining whether the resource will pose a security risk if allowing the request (Farber, see inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 50).

85. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farber within the system of Brothers because Farber discloses resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment as part of emerging internet-based applications.

86. As per claim 62, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). The claim recites allowing the request for the resource if determining that the request does not pose a security risk and if determining that the resource does not pose a security risk. Brothers further teach the request can't be allowed if determining the request poses a security risk (Brothers, see inter alia, Figure 8) and subsequently Farber also teaches the access to the resource can't be allowed if determining the resource poses a security risk. This is because the True Name (i.e. unique resource ID) has been changed (Farber, see inter alia, Figure 28). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

87. As per claim 63, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator

Art Unit: 2131

having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

88. As per claim 64, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

89. As per claim 65, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

90. As per claim 66, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

Art Unit: 2131

a. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57; and

91. b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

92. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

93. As per claim 67, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

a. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);

b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent; if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource remotely located, the resource replicated from the original source (Farber: inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

c. comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the

Art Unit: 2131

second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

94. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

95. As per claim 68, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

96. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57);

b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28);

c. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource remotely located, the resource replicated from the original resource (Farber, see inter alia, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

d. comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28);

e. if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, replacing the resource with a copy of the original resource and replacing the cached

Art Unit: 2131

descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber, see inter alia, Column 37 Line 51 – 52, Column 31 Line 31 – 32 and Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

97. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

98. As per claim 69, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 61. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

99. As per claim 70, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 68). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 68. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 703-305-0710. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-5:00pm.


Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

LBC


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100